



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
01/10/2001	Jennifer Lu	5075-0028	9598
23980 7590 03/23/2006 REED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP		EXAMINER	
		MAGEE, CHRISTOPHER R	
 -		ARTINIT	PAPER NUMBER
), CA 94304-1124		2627	THE EX NOMBER
	01/10/2001 7590 03/23/2006	01/10/2001 Jennifer Lu 7590 03/23/2006 ELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP MILL ROAD	01/10/2001 Jennifer Lu 5075-0028 7590 03/23/2006 EXAM ELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP MAGEE, CHR MILL ROAD O, CA 94304-1124 ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The MAILING DATE of this communication appear Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ca Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(STE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ca Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date	Christopher R. Magee ars on the cover sheet with the could be seen to the cover sheet with the could be seen to the cover sheet with the could be seen to the cover sheet with the could be seen to the cover sheet with the could be seen to the cover sheet with t	2653 orrespondence address S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ca Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(STE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	orrespondence address S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, can yreply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date.	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(STE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ca Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing day	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	ection is non-final. se except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-27 and 40 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-27 and 40 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	n from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing sheet(s) including the correction and the order are considered to by the Example 11). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	oted or b) objected to by the E rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See n is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign properties a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents the certified copies of the priority documents the copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau (* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application y documents have been receiven (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	

Application/Control Number: 09/758,939 Page 2

Art Unit: 2653

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/12/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- Claims 1-6, 10-16, 22 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zheng et al. (hereinafter Zheng) (US 6,870,707 B1).

Regarding claims 1-4, 14-16, 22 and 40, Zheng discloses a method for producing a transducer slider having at least one tapered edge or rounded corner [col. 4, lines 54-55], comprising:

(a) coating a substrate with a radiation-sensitive layer [col. 9, lines 17-18];

Application/Control Number: 09/758,939 Page 3

Art Unit: 2653

(b) imagewise exposing the radiation-sensitive layer to radiation according to an intensity pattern having a gradient conforming to said at least one tapered edge, said intensity pattern

enabling specific levels of removal of portions of the radiation sensitive layer corresponding to

the specific intensity pattern used [col. 9. lines 19-29];

(c) developing the image into the radiation-sensitive layer [col. 9, lines 30-37]; and

(d) transferring the image into the substrate to form a transducer slider having a surface

profile comprising said at least one tapered edge or a rounded corner as provided by the specific

intensity pattern [Figs. 3A-E and 4A-C].

Regarding claim 5 and 6, Zheng teaches the radiation-sensitive layer is a positive resist

[col. 6, lines 6-11].

Regarding claim 10, Zheng discloses the radiation has an ultraviolet wavelength [col. 6,

lines 1-5].

Regarding claims 11-13, Zheng discloses the intensity pattern being provided using a

grayscale mask [col. 6, lines 32-42].

Application/Control Number: 09/758,939 Page 4

Art Unit: 2653

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

• Claims 7, 8, 17-19 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng et al. (hereinafter Zheng) (US 6,870,707 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further

in view of Hira et al. (hereinafter Hira) (US 5,910,864).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Zheng discloses all the features, *supra*, but does not teach or suggest the radiation sensitive layer (i.e., grayscale mask) has a thickness of about 1 to 20 μ m. Hira teaches the radiation sensitive layer has a thickness of about 1 to 20 μ m [col. 12, lines 36-38; col. 13, lines 11-20].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture the radiation sensitive layer thickness of Zheng with the thickness as taught by Hira.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to manufacture the radiation sensitive layer thickness of Zheng with the thickness as taught by Hira in order to eliminate a residual redeposition layer [Hira; col. 13, lines 21-28].

Regarding claims 17-19, Zheng discloses all the features, *supra*, but does not teach or suggest the etchant comprises an Argon based gas [col. 7, lines 27-30]. Hira discloses the etchant comprises an Argon based gas [col. 27, lines 45-49].

Page 5

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the etchant of Zheng with an Argon based etchant as taught by Hira.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the etchant of Zheng with an Argon based etchant as taught by Hira in order to process a material of a small etching rate (e.g., a ceramic or a high dielectric) in a short time, accurately, safely and easily [Hira; col. 30, lines 33-38].

Regarding claims 23-27, Zheng discloses all the features, *supra*, but does not teach or suggest the substrate comprises a ceramic material. Hira teaches the substrate comprises a ceramic material [col. 23, lines 33-39].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the substrate of Zheng with a ceramic material as taught by Hira.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the substrate of Zheng with a ceramic material as taught by Hira in order to give a small dimensional shift, making it possible to form magnetic head rails of high dimensional accuracy [Hira; col. 9, lines 51-55].

• Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng et al. (hereinafter Zheng) (US 6,870,707 B1) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Dickinson, Jr. (hereinafter Dickinson) (US 6,350,506).

Regarding claim 9, Zheng disclose all the described features, *supra*, but do not teach or suggest the radiation is photonic.

Dickinson teaches exposing a surface to laser radiation that is monochromatic radiation, which results from photon stimulated emission, i.e., photonic radiation [col. 1, lines 40-47; col. 4, lines 55-63].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the radiation of Zheng with photonic radiation via a laser as taught by Dickinson.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to substitute the radiation of Zheng with photonic radiation via a laser as taught by Dickinson in order to maintain close dimensional control [Dickinson; col. 2, lines 25-28].

• Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng et al. (hereinafter Zheng) (US 6,870,707 B1) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Yoshida et al. (Yoshida) (US 5,331,495).

Regarding claims 20 and 21, Zheng disclose all the described features, *supra*, but do not teach or suggest the enchant comprises a liquid.

Yoshida teaches a resulting mask pattern is subjected to wet treatment by a liquid etchant for patterning [col. 8, lines 64-67].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expose the substrate of Zheng with a liquid etchant as taught by Yoshida.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to expose the substrate of Zheng with a liquid etchant as taught by Yoshida in order to achieve a stable lift off and with the least changes in the substrate profile [Yoshida; col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 2].

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 and 40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Magee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7592. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8: 00 am-4: 30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher R. Magee Patent Examiner Art Unit 2627

March 17, 2006 crm

WILLIAM KORZÜCH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600